

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicant would like to thank the Examiner for the careful consideration given the present application. The application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office action, and the following remarks are presented for the Examiner's consideration.

The Examiner rejects claims 1 and 8-10 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,739,737 to Hatton (hereinafter Hatton) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,259,170, to Limoge et al. (hereinafter Limoge et al.). The Examiner further rejects claims 2 and 4-6 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hatton in view of Limoge et al. as applied to claim 1, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,782,301 to Dohi et al. The Examiner also rejects claims 3 and 7 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hatton in view of Limoge et al. as applied to claims 1 and 2 and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,278,919 to Hwang et al. Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections for exemplary reasons stated below.

Claim 1 of the present application recites:

A compact fuse holder for an automobile which comprises: a small plate including at least two protective circuits, each one of them comprises a **resettable fuse** consisting in a **positive temperature coefficient element (PTC)** connected to two terminals, being each pair of terminals of each of the protective devices connected to a light signal generating circuit, wherein each protective circuit presents two input and output connectors, and such each pair of terminals are additionally connected to a sole second light signal. (emphasis added).

Claim 1 requires a resettable fuse consisting in a positive temperature coefficient element (PCT). As stated, for example, on page 6, lines 21-24 of the specification, these resettable fuses can interrupt current flow when reaching a certain temperature and thereafter reset to reinstate the connection when the resettable fuse cools down and after the damaged element at issue is repaired. In sharp contrast, Hatton fails to disclose a resettable fuse consisting in a positive temperature coefficient element (PCT) as required by claim 1. Rather, Hatton discloses a “blown fuse indicator” that only incorporates regular burn-out resistance fuses that are not resettable. Indeed, Hatton states that the fuses include an electrical resistance strip that “burns out” to create an open circuit to thereby cut off the flow of electricity to a system component if the flow of electricity through the fuse exceeds a predetermined level. See column

4, lines 31-36 of Hatton. In order to reinstate the circuit, the ruined burn-out fuse must be removed and replaced with a new working burn-out fuse. See column 4, lines 61-63 of Hatton. Hatton therefore only teaches a blown fuse indicator incorporating a burn-out fuse and does not teach or suggest use of a resettable fuse as required by claim 1 of the present application.

The Examiner admits that Hatton fails to disclose the fuse comprising a positive temperature coefficient element (PCT) but argues that it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use PCT in the device, as taught by Limoge et al., to utilize advantages of the resettable fuse of new technology. Applicant respectfully traverses this assertion. In fact, Hatton teaches away from incorporating a polymeric positive temperature coefficient resettable fuse and any such incorporation would necessarily destroy the teachings of Hatton. Hatton suggests use of an indicator to identify a blown fuse to permit location and replacement of the blown fuse. (e.g., see column 1, lines 5-8; and column 5, lines 42-44). In contrast, the resettable fuse of Limoge et al. does not require fuse replacement and does not identify a fuse for replacement. The proposed modification would necessarily destroy the teachings of Hatton since incorporating the resettable fuse of Limoge et al. would defeat the purpose of using an indicator to locate a burned out fuse for replacement as set forth by Hatton. As Hatton in view of Limoge et al. fail to teach or suggest the above-referenced limitations set forth in claim 1, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the corresponding rejection and allowance of the application. Applicant further requests withdrawal of the rejections of claims 2-10 as depending directly or indirectly from claim 1 which is believed to be allowable for exemplary reasons set forth above.

Claims 2-10 are also believed to include further distinctive elements not taught or suggested by the cited references. For example, claim 10 recites that the input and output connectors of each protective circuit are all male, all female, or male for the input and female for the output, or viceversa. These limitations are not believed to be taught or suggested by Hatton in view of Limoge. Applicant therefore respectfully further requests allowance of claim 10 for this additional reason.

In addition, claims 3 and 7 each require the sole second light signal to be installed in the vehicle dashboard. In contrast, Hwang et al. discloses an element (140) located in the dashboard. In the specification, element (140) is identified as an operation switch to be turned on when speaker operation is decided (col. 9, lines 38-45). Neither Hwang et al., Hatton, Limoge et al. nor Dohi provide any teaching or suggestion of locating a second light signal in the vehicle dashboard as required by claims 3 and 7. Applicant therefore further respectfully requests allowance of claims 3 and 7 for this additional reason.

Additionally, the applicant respectfully wish to call the attention on the fact that instant application refers to a novel and nonobvious compact fuse holder that incorporates a resettable fuse consisting in a positive temperature coefficient element (PTC) and a light signal generating circuit. The Applicant respectfully asserts that the claims of the instant application are neither taught nor suggested by the cited references.

In light of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in a condition for allowance and notice to that effect is hereby requested. If it is determined that the application is not in a condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to initiate a telephone interview with the undersigned attorney to expedite prosecution of the present application.

If there are any additional fees resulting from this communication, please charge same to our Deposit Account No. 16-0820, our Order No. 36322.

Respectfully submitted,

PEARNE & GORDON LLP

By: 
Stephen S. Wentsler, Reg. No. 46403

1801 East 9th Street
Suite 1200
Cleveland, Ohio 44114-3108
(216) 579-1700

Date: December 23, 2004